Document 46

Filed 08/28/2008

Page 1 of 7

Case 4:08-cv-02677-SBA

A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

REED SMITH LLP

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

All Defendants have filed motions to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. Plaintiff failed to oppose or respond to these motions in any substantive or meaningful way. The motions were set for hearing on July 29, 2008, but the hearing was vacated and the motions taken under submission by this Court. The parties await this Court's rulings on the motions.

Defendants believe it is premature to discuss and formulate a discovery plan until the Court rules on the motions, in particular, given that this Court dismissed a nearly identical complaint filed by Plaintiff in an earlier related action. Therefore, Defendants request that the case be exempted from Rule 26(f) planning until the above motions are decided and an order entered thereon.

Nevertheless, to the extent a Rule 26(f) statement is required, Defendants state as follows:

#### JOINT STATEMENT OF FACTS UNDERLYING THE ACTION A.

A brief description of the events underlying the action:

At issue in this case is a mortgage in Plaintiff's name, about which Plaintiff unsuccessfully brought the same action against these same Defendants in 2004. Among other issues, Plaintiff alleges improprieties regarding the accounting on the mortgage and foreclosure efforts on same.

#### PRINCIPAL ISSUES В.

The principal factual issues which the parties dispute: 2.

Defendants dispute Plaintiff's factual allegations in their entirety.

The principal legal issues which the parties dispute: 3.

Pursuant to the motions for dismissal before this Court, Defendants believe that Plaintiff's causes of actions are substantively and procedurally deficient. Specifically, the motions assert that Plaintiff has failed to state a cause of action to support any of her claims, that all of her claims are time-barred by their respective statutes of limitation, and that the entire action is barred by the doctrines of claim and issue preclusion.

The other factual issues [e.g. service of process, personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction or venue] which remain unresolved for the reason stated below and how the parties propose to resolve those issues:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants caused this action to be removed from state to federal court. Plaintiff has filed a motion for remand, which has also been taken under submission by this Court, and upon which the parties await a ruling.

5. The parties which have not been served and the reasons:

Defendants were not properly served in the state court action, but have each and all voluntarily appeared in this action.

6. The additional parties which the below-specified parties intend to join and the intended time frame for such joinder:

Defendants do not currently intend to join any parties, but reserve the right to do so as the facts develop in this action.

## C. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

7. Please indicate the appropriate response(s).]

The parties filed a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference and are awaiting scheduling of the phone conference.

## D. CONSENT TO JURISDICTION BY A MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9. The following parties consent to assignment of this case to a United States Magistrate

Judge for [court or jury] trial:

None.

### E. DISCLOSURES

11. The parties certify that they have made the following disclosures [list disclosures of persons, documents, damage computations and insurance agreements]:

Pending this Court's ruling on the Defendants' motions to dismiss, the Defendants have not yet made initial disclosures to Plaintiff.

## F. EARLY FILING OF MOTIONS

12. The following motions expected to have a significant effect either on the scope of discovery or other aspects of the litigation shall be heard by the date specified below:

Defendants identify their motions to dismiss, which are currently under submission to this Court.

#### G. **DISCOVERY**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- The parties agree to the following discovery plan [Describe the plan e.g., any 13. limitation on the number, duration or subject matter for various kinds of discovery; discovery from experts: deadlines for completing discovery]:
- Disclosure of identities of all witnesses to be called in each party's case-in-chief to be a) exchanged by: February 2, 2009
- Fact discovery, including subpoenas for documents, document requests, depositions, b) interrogatories, requests for admissions and depositions, to be completed by: March 13, 2009.
  - The parties do not anticipate any expert disclosures or discovery in this matter. c)

#### PRETRIAL AND TRIAL SCHEDULE H.

- 14. Requested trial date: June 22, 2009.
- Three (3) days. 15. Anticipated length of trial:
- 16. Type of trial: Court.
- Final pretrial conference: June 12, 2009. 17.
- Joint pretrial conference statement and proposed pretrial order: June 5, 2009. 18.
- Objections to exhibits or testimony: June 12, 2009. 19.
- May 26, Deadline to hear motions directed to the merits of all or part of the case: 20.

2009. 18

19

/// 20

/// 21

/// 22

/// 23

/// 24

/// 25

26 ///

27 ///

/// 28

Case 4:08-cv-02677-SBA	Document 46	Filed 08/28/2008	Page 5 of 7
------------------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

	1	k. IDENTIFICATION AND <u>SIGNATURE</u> LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL			
REED SMITH LLP A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware	2	D. 477777 4 4 4 20 20 20	DEED CMITHLER		
	3	DATED: August 28, 2008	REED SMITH LLP		
	4				
	5		By /s/ Scott H. Jacobs Scott H. Jacobs		
	6		Christopher O. Rivas Attorneys for Defendants		
	7 8		WMC MORTGAGE, LLC AND GE CONSUMER FINANCE, INC.		
	9		GE CONSONER I INVITCE, INC.		
	10	DATED: August 28, 2008	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL A. GAMER		
	11	DATED. August 20, 2000	LAW Office of British in Grinds		
	12		By /s/ Glenn D. Kabanuck		
	13		Daniel A. Gamer		
	14		Glenn D. Kabanuck Attorneys for Defendant		
	15		CALIFORNIA LAND TITLE OF MARIN		
	16				
A	17	DATED: August 28, 2008	WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP		
	18				
	19		By /s/ Robin P. Wright		
	20		Robin P. Wright Attorneys for Defendant		
	21		SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, INC.		
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25 26				
	26 27				
	28				
	20				

A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

REED SMITH LLP

## CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

The Court finds that each party was represented by lead trial counsel responsible for trial of this matter and was given an opportunity to be heard as to all matters encompassed by this Joint Case Management Statement and Proposed Order filed prior to the conference.

The Case Management Statement and Proposed Order is hereby adopted by the Court as the Case Management Order for the case and the parties are ordered to comply with this Order.

Dated:	, 2008
valtu.	9 25 000

United States District/Magistrate Judge

- 5 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made. My business address is REED SMITH LLP, 355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2900, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On August 28, 2008, I electronically filed the following document(s) with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent electronic notification of such filing to all other parties appearing on the docket sheet, as listed below.

# JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF DEFENDANTS; PROPOSED ORDER

by transmitting via email to the parties at the email addresses listed below:

Daniel A. Gamer dan@gamerlaw.com, pat@gamerlaw.com Glenn David Kabanuck glenn@gamerlaw.com Robin Prema Wright rwright@wrightlegal.net, ggrant@wrightlegal.net

by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in this Declaration.

Patricia C. Barbera 24 Caribe Isle Novato, CA 94949

Telephone: (415) 382-9617 Facsimile: (415) 382-0756

In Pro Per

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 28, 2008, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Donna Martin
Donna Martin

27

28